

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization                           | Public, District, MPO?    | Chapter   | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---|--|
| 1         | Dahle, Brian      | California State Assembly              | State Legislator          | N/A       | N/A     | Re-incorporate SR 49 and SR 20 into the 2015 ITSP as one of the Strategic Interregional Corridors   | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |
| 2         | Gaines, Ted       | California State Senator               | State Legislator          | N/A       | N/A     | Re-incorporate SR 49 and SR 20 into the 2015 ITSP as one of the Strategic Interregional Corridors   | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |
| 3         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 4 | 4.3     | Add I-5 as a Priority Facility in the South Coast Corridor  | I-5 was added as a Priority Interregional Facility   |
| 4         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 3 | 3.4     | Replace Primary Freight Network map with adopted map in CFMP  | The map was replaced.  |
| 5         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 3 | 3.3     | The ITSP may wish to note the ability of the High Speed Rail system to handle many intra-California trips that would otherwise need to be handled by air travel. This benefit of the HSR system may allow the limited capacity of many California airports to be focused on longer distance domestic and international trips. | Comment noted. This was included in the interregional priorities section of the San Jose/ San Francisco Bay Area - Central Valley - Los Angeles Corridor.  |
| 6         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 3 | 3.5     | Second paragraph, second sentence: it would be good to add a reference to the "8th largest economy in the world in 2013" statement.<br><br>Gateways section, first sentence: consider stating as "international border land ports of entry."  | Updated.   |
| 7         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 3 | 3.5     | Last Mile Connectors section, second sentence: Consider adding as follows "These roadways to sea and land ports, commercial airports..."  | Updated.   |
| 8         | Gallegos, Gary    | SANDAG                                 | MPO                       | Chapter 3 | 3.5     | Draft Major Freight Facilities map, POE table: is the intent to not include land ports of entry serving rail? Calexico East serves Imperial County's truck trips, while Calexico (West) serves the UP service. Additional, San Ysidro in San Diego serves San Diego and Imperial Valley Railroad trains.                      | The map included was taken from the CFMP.  |
| 9         | Cooper, Eileen    | Friends of Del Norte                   | Public                    | N/A       | N/A     | Commends Caltrans for excluding US 199 and SR 197 from the ITSP. Email includes list of supporters against the expansion of US 199 and SR 197.  | Comment noted.   |
| 10        | Pedersen, Debbie  | Modoc County Transportation Commission | Transportation Commission | N/A       | N/A     | Opposed to the deletion of US 395 from Susanville to Oregon; SR 49 from Auburn to Grass Valley; and SR 20 from I-80 to I-5.   | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.<br><br>The analysis of the Sacramento Valley to Oregon Corridor showed that I-5 had greater impact on the interregional transportation system than SR 395 from Susanville to Oregon. |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization    | Public, District, MPO?    | Chapter | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|---|--|
| 11        | Quilter, Clint    | Inyo County LTC | Transportation Commission | N/A     | N/A     | <p>Supports the identification of US 395 and SR 14 facilities as a high priority in the ITSP. Cites MOU between Mono, Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino counties to allocate funds for improvements on both these facilities.</p> <p>Identifies funds dedicated to Eastern Sierra Transit Authority to extend service to regional hubs, such as service from Lone Pin to Reno, and Mammoth Lakes to Palmdale linking to Metrolink.</p>   | Comment noted.   |
| 12        | Landon, Daniel    | NCTC            | Transportation Commission |         |         | <p>Add SR 49 and SR 20 back into ITSP. Current iteration of Draft ITSP did not include analysis or modeling on recreational tourism.</p> <p>SR 49 and SR 20 are utilized as emergency detour routes when I-5 and I-80 are closed for major accidents, wildfires, and construction.</p> <p>Cites Nevada County's crop production value (23 million) and Caltrans District 3's Goods Movement Study and the heavy duty (5+ axle trucks) is forecast to increase by 69 percent.</p> <p>Cites historical partnership between NCTC and Caltrans; reiterates importance of partnership again in order to reduce congestion, improve safety, reduce delays, and increase throughput on SR 20 and SR 49 corridors. Additionally cites safety concerns and the letter from former District 3 Director Jody Jones.</p> <p>Cites that SR 49 is a lifeline route to several communities in Nevada, Place, and Sierra Counties and is a multimodal corridor that provides connections to Placer County Transit and Amtrak Intercity Capital Corridor at Auburn's Conheim Multimodal Station. Completion of SR 49 will enhance the facility's existing function as an interregional bicycle facility.</p> | <p>SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.</p> <p>Alternate routes were not included in the list of the Priority Interregional Facilities.</p> <p>The 69% increase in freight is significant, but the majority of the trips in Nevada County are projected to be on I-80, which is included as a Priority Interregional Facility. The value of freight movement on I-80 from San Francisco to Northern Nevada is expected to increase 90% from \$4.4 billion to \$8.3 billion by 2040. Even with an increase in freight movement on SR 49, I-80 is expected to remain the most significant highway for interregional travel through the corridor.</p> <p>District 3 will continue to partner with NCTC to develop system improvements. Safety concerns can be address through a variety of funding sources including SHOPP. Also, projects proposed for SR 49 and SR 20 will be assess through the project evaluation criteria and can be funded if they score high.</p> |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization                               | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter | Section | Comments   | Addressed   |
|-----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------|---------|--|---|
| 13        | Smith, Paul       | Rural County Representatives of California | Public                 | N/A     | N/A     | <p>Include highway facilities from previous ITSP in 2015 ITSP (SR 20, 49, 198, and US 395) in order to compete for ITIP funding. Concerned that connectivity will be loss for many counties located in North state area in California. Cites 20 year planning horizon to 2033, based on the 2013 ITSP Status Update.</p> <p>Suggests that analysis should have included recreational travel and tourism along with Goods movement.</p> | <p>Many highways from the Focus Routes were included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities including SR 299, SR 44, SR 36, the majority of US 395, SR 14, SR 152, SR 156, SR 41, SR 46, and US 101.</p> <p>The 2013 ITSP Status Update was not a full update of the ITSP and instead assessed the progress that had been made in the first 15 years of the 1998 ITSP.</p> <p>Some highways were not included because the analysis of the Strategic Interregional Corridors and the connections between the regions identified other facilities to be included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities.</p> <p>Recreational travel, tourism, and freight was considered in the analysis of the interregional system. Freight was stressed in the corridor analysis because of the level of available data.</p> |
| 14        | Jones, Bruce      | Citizens for Highway 49 Safety             | Public                 | N/A     | N/A     | Do not eliminate SR 49 as a "Focus Route."   | Focus Routes were not included in the 2015 ITSP. Priority Interregional Facilities were developed which were based on different objectives than the 1998 ITSP. SR 49 was not included as a Priority Interregional Facility because I-80 was deemed the more significant interregional facilities in the San Francisco Bay Area - Sacramento - Northern Nevada Corridor.   |
| 15        | Bice, J.          |  | Public                 | N/A     | N/A     | Reconsider the removal of SR 20/49 in Nevada and Placer counties.  | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in a Strategic Interregional Corridor, but not added as a Priority Interregional Facility.  |
| 16        | Gallagher, James  | California State Assembly                  | State Legislator       | N/A     | N/A     | Include SR 99 between Yuba City and SR 20 between I-5 and I-80.  | SR 70 was identified as a Priority Interregional Facility instead of SR 99 between Yuba City and SR 20. SR 20 from I-5 to I-80 was not included as a Priority Interregional Facility because I-5 to I-80 and I-80 to the Nevada County line were more significant interregional facilities for recreational tourism and freight movement.   |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter | Section | Comments  | Addressed   |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---|
| 17        | Welborne, Martha  | Metro        | MPO                    |         |         | <p>Address the significant gaps in access to the major air and seaports of the greater LA region and connectivity between various Strategic Interregional Corridors. Requests that more ITIP be spent in LA.</p> <p>Requests inclusion of SR 138 as a corridor in the high desert area of LA Metro. The ITSP should provide some basic principles for approaching multimodal investment decision-making, as well as project prioritization within modes.</p> <p>Recognize non-motorized projects in ITSP.</p> | <p>The air and seaports, along with the Tier 1 Freight Network, in the Los Angeles region were included in the summary or maps of the Southern California Concepts.</p> <p>SR 138 was not included as a Priority Interregional Facility because it does not connect regions.</p> <p>The project evaluation criteria includes multimodal considerations.</p> <p>The corridor concepts incorporate active transportation in the corridor summaries. Future ITSPs will utilize the under development California Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to refine non-motorized system elements.</p> |
| 18        | Kennett, Wendy    |              | Public                 | N/A     | N/A     | <p>Reconsider the removal of SR 20/49 in Nevada and Placer counties. SR 49 between Grass Valley and Auburn has needed improvement and widening; finish what has been started. Dangerous, highly trafficked and should be a high priority.</p>   | <p>SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.</p> <p>Non-Priority Interregional Facilities can compete for ITIP funds through the project evaluation criteria. Caltrans has non-ITIP funds that can address highway safety issues.</p>   |
| 19        | Moore, Jeff       |              | Public                 | N/A     | N/A     | <p>Reconsider the removal of SR 49.</p>   | <p>Focus Routes were not included in the 2015 ITSP. Priority Interregional Facilities were developed which were based on different objectives than the 1998 ITSP.</p> <p>SR 49 was included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as a Priority Interregional Facility. This is an important routes to the local region and the State, but I-80 facilitates considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.</p>  |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization   | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments  | Addressed   |
|-----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|-----------|---------|---|---|
| 20        | Multiple Signers  | Alpine County LTC, Amador CTC, Calaveras COG, Tuolumne County Transportation Council | RTPA                   | N/A       | N/A     | <p>ITSP focuses too heavily on the national freight corridors, which already have dedicated Federal funding sources, and not on other IRRS routes that do not have a dedicated source of revenue for improvements.</p> <p>Disappointed that CHSR and Interstate highways are recommendations for ITIP funding. Funding Interstates will result in increased congestion and reduced safety along other IRRS routes which is in direct conflict with Governor Brown's Executive Order B-30-15.</p> <p>Recommends the ITSP provide a discussion of the High Emphasis Routes that are on the IRRS but are not one of the 11 Strategic Interregional Corridors. Believes if recreational analysis had been done in conjunction with goods movement, then the Strategic Interregional Corridors would be different.</p> <p>Recommends an additional performance metric to be included: Is the congestion problem being solved/created by recreational travel? The new set of performance indicators could potentially eliminate the competitiveness of rural counties and non-Strategic Interregional Corridors from being competitive in being awarded ITIP funds.</p> | <p>The CHSR and Interstates that are Tier 1 Freight Facilities outside the urbanized area are key elements of a comprehensive interregional transportation system. The Corridor Priorities section of the concepts recommends Proposition 1A and GHG reduction funds be used for CHSR improvements, not ITIP.</p> <p>The 2015 ITSP did not include a discussion on the High Emphasis routes since they are not in the plan. A high number of the High Emphasis Routes were either included as Priority Interregional Facilities or included in the Strategic Interregional Corridor summaries.</p> <p>B-30-15 is included in the project evaluation criteria and will be considered during project selection.</p> <p>Recreational tourism was a factor in comparing facilities for inclusion in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities. The first requirement was accessibility between regions. If there were multiple facilities that connected regions, the priority went to the one that served recreational tourism and freight the best.</p> <p>The recreational travel performance measure was not included in the criteria, but will be considered as the criteria is refined.</p> |
| 21        | Adamson, Heather  | AMBAG  | MPO                    | N/A       | N/A     | <p>Recommends that US 101 be designated as a PFN. Add SR 41 back into ITSP (mapping error, SR 41 is included). Commends that ITSP continues to support intercity rail.</p> <p>Finds the facility profile maps to be confusing; too much information in one chart and suggests separating so it is more easily understandable.</p>   | <p>The Primary Freight Network is defined in the California Freight Mobility Plan and not the ITSP.</p>   |
| 22        | Adamson, Heather  | AMBAG  | MPO                    | Chapter 4 |         | <p><b>Central Coast Corridor Concept</b></p> <p>Final ITSP should include the San Benito Local Transportation Authority (LTA) in addition to all the other local, regional, and inter-county services that provide regional transit services.</p>   | Updated.  |
| 23        | Adamson, Heather  | AMBAG  | MPO                    | Chapter 4 |         | <p><b>Central Coast Corridor Concept</b></p> <p>Requests that Monterey and San Benito counties be included in the "Fix-it-first policies for US 101..."</p>   | Updated.  |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization  | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|-----------|---------|---|--|
| 24        | Nielsen, Jim      | California State Senator                            | State Legislator       | N/A       | N/A     | Include SR 20 from I-5 to I-80 and SR 99 99/70 northbound.  | <p>SR 20 was not included as a Priority Interregional Facility from I-5 to I-80 because I-5 south to I-80 and I-80 east to the Nevada County line supports higher levels of interregional person and goods movement. Also, corridor analysis showed the majority of travel on SR 20 was local and regional, not interregional.</p> <p>SR 99 from SR 99/70 to SR 149 was not included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities. SR 70/SR 149 and I-5 were identified instead as Priority Interregional Facilities for the corridor. SR 99 north of SR 149 is included as a Priority Interregional Facility.</p> |
| 25        | Hernandez, Paul   | Center for Sustainable Energy                       | Public                 |           |         | <p>ITSP should provide details as to the location and adoption patterns of ZEVs - CSE recommends that Caltrans reference the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project rebate statistics on ZEVs; and the CEC's Statewide Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Assessment. The inclusion of this information can help support the development of the West Coast Green Highway.</p> <p>CSE recommends that the ITSP provide a stronger link to the CHSR Authority's environmental policy objectives, which includes powering a system with 100% renewable energy.</p> <p>Overall CSE commends Caltrans' on including the West Coast Green Highway and the State's ZEV Action Plan as one way to achieve the Governor's Climate Change policies.</p>  | <p>The ITSP includes a map of California's Electric Vehicle Fast Charging Stations.</p> <p>Caltrans will work with public and private agencies to improve clean vehicle infrastructure and will identifies ways to strengthen this information in future ITSPs.</p>  |
| 26        | Fiske, Colin      | Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities | Public                 | Chapter 4 |         | <p><b>North Coast Corridor Concept</b></p> <p>Re-examine goal to maximize interregional mobility. Consider the possibility that some limits on interregional mobility may actually benefit the state, allowing local areas and regions to maintain their unique character and livability along with sustainable local economies.</p> <p>The only two-lane segments singled out on the US 101 analysis are urban streets whose conversion into freeway or expressway configurations (currently underway in Willits) will only benefit through-way truck traffic. It is not at all clear that this constitutes the “greatest benefit” for all transportation system users when the bulk of congestion is caused by local traffic.</p> <p>Reconsider its conclusions about closing two-lane “gaps” in the corridor, should abandon its plans for oversized STAA truck access through Richardson Grove, and should instead spend limited taxpayer funds where they are most needed in the corridor.</p> <p>The impending availability of this route to STAA trucks must be considered in analyses of freight mobility for other North Coast-accessing corridors, notably the US 101 and Hwy 199/197 corridors mentioned above</p> | <p>Analysis of future projects to support interregional transportation will need to consider sustainability.</p> <p>Increasing system capacity through expansion projects is an allowable type of improvement, but it should be the last option.</p>   |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization  | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|---|------------------------|-----------|---------|---|--|
| 27        | Fiske, Colin      | Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities | Public                 | Chapter 3 |         | The M-5 and M-580 Marine Highway Corridors, shown in Figure 11, are discussed nowhere else in the draft ITSP. This oversight is striking and should be corrected. For freight movement, these corridors are extremely important, as they already provide a viable alternative to some truck- and train-based interregional transportation. Further well-planned development of these marine corridors could provide an even more economical and environmentally sustainable mode of interregional transportation for many coastal and Delta communities                           | The ITSP deferred to the California Freight Mobility Plan to assess the value and impacts of the Marine Highway Corridors and any conclusions or plans will be considered for inclusion in future ITSPs. The focus on the intercity rail and highways reflect the connection to the ITIP which only funds highway and intercity rail corridors.  |
| 28        | Kempton, Will     | CTC   |                        | N/A       | N/A     | <p>Suggests greater emphasis on freight connectivity, in particular to the airports and seaports (POLA and POLB).</p> <p>Recommends including I-5 in the San Diego-Mexico Border - Inland Empire, and SR 74 in its entirety.</p> <p>The plan should clearly explain projects on the strategic corridors will be selected for ITIP funding, and specify whether projects beyond the eleven strategic corridors would be considered and recommended for ITIP funding.</p> <p>The ITSP should clearly identify the methodology for selecting projects for inclusion in the ITIP.</p> | <p>Connections to major seaports and commercial airports were identified in the appropriate corridors and corridor concept maps. The plan also included a California Freight Mobility section with maps highlighting the key freight network facilities including highways, rail corridors, airports, seaports, and international land ports throughout the State.</p> <p>Interstate 5 in Southern California was added as a Priority Interregional Facilities in the South Coast-Central Coast Corridor because it is an important element of a significant interregional freight facility. On the other hand, State Route 74 was not added as a Priority Interregional Facility because traffic analysis showed it currently does not facilitate significant freight movement and does not connect regions.</p> <p>The connection between the ITSP and the development of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) was further emphasized in the plan. Projects considered for inclusion in the ITIP will be analyzed based on the six objectives of the 2015 ITSP and the Project Evaluation Criteria outlined in Chapter 5.</p> |
| 29        | King, Terri       | Kings County Association of Governments             | MPO                    | Chapter 4 |         | <p><b>Central Coast - Central Valley Corridor Concept</b></p> <p>Reconsider the removal of SR 198. Provides access to three National Parks and Lemoore Naval Air Station, which is one of the major strategic military aviation facilities in the western US. Important east-west facility. Highlights its importance to the agricultural industry.</p> <p>SR 198 would also optimize multimodal connectivity to an intermodal facility for the Amtrak San Joaquin intercity passenger rail service, and the proposed high speed rail station in Hanford.</p>                     | SR 198 was not included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities since it does not connect regions, it is contained within the Central Valley Region.  |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter  | Organization                                | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments   | Addressed  |
|-----------|--------------------|---|------------------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| 30        | Bergener, Jennifer | LOSSAN                                      | JPA                    | N/A       | N/A     | <p>Intercity rail needs a steady and reliable source of funding.</p> <p>Suggests prioritizing intercity rail improvements and service expansion in rail corridors that parallel or are adjacent to facilities that demonstrated high total VMT, including I-5 and US 101 in So Cal, as those two present the most promising opportunities for ridership growth and shifting demand from highways to rail.</p> <p>Suggests reference to the 2012 LOSSAN Strategic Implementation Plan and LOSSAN Agency Business Plan for FY 15/16 and 16/17 with regard to proposed capital improvements on the LOSSAN rail corridor and increased service levels on Pacific Surfliner. Additional trips on the Surfliner require lots of money and extensive capital improvements. Any expansion requires negotiations with multiple public and private rail service operators.</p>   | <p>The ITSP does not control fund sources.</p> <p>Comments regarding the prioritization of intercity rail projects will be considered during the development of the next California State Rail Plan. The California State Rail Plan will identify future rail projects. The funding of these projects will be determined through the project evaluation criteria, which will consider mode shift and the integration of multiple modes of travel.</p> <p>The LOSSAN Strategic Implementation Plan and the LOSSAN Agency Business Plan will be considered during the identification of capital improvement proposals.</p> |
| 31        | Burns, Scott       | Mono County Local Transportation Commission | RTPA                   | N/A       | N/A     | Commends that the ITSP identified US 395/SR 14 as one of the Strategic Interregional Corridors. MCLTC remains committed to its partnerships for funding corridor improvements, and cites the pre-existing MOU between Mono, Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino counties and its partnership with Caltrans.   | Comment noted.   |
| 32        | Heminger, Steve    | MTC   | MPO                    | Chapter 1 | 1.2     | <p><b>Background</b><br/>ITSP should identify future update cycles, which would be helpful to the reader.</p> <p><b>Planning for Operations</b><br/>MTC strongly encourages Caltrans to examine funding operational types of projects to improve the Interregional Hwy System and include a discussion of express lanes as another important operation strategy that helps to increase person throughput on a travel lane (while reducing VMT and GHG emissions).</p>  | Specific improvements such as express lanes will be analyzed if nominated for ITIP funds. The analysis will assess impacts of regional commute improvements versus interregional improvements.   |
| 33        | Heminger, Steve    | MTC   | MPO                    | Chapter 3 | 3.5     | MTC supports the continued use of the TCIF program framework for identifying and programming trade corridor funds to needed improvements. The Legislature extended the program indefinitely under law (SB 1228), highlighting the successes of this program framework.   | Comment noted.   |
| 34        | Heminger, Steve    | MTC   | MPO                    | Chapter 4 | 4.3     | <p><b>San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area - Sacramento - Northern Nevada Corridor</b><br/>The ITSP should recognize the importance of freight connections to the Port of Oakland since it is the 5th busiest port in the nation. Caltrans should identify potential improvements on the Capitol Corridor, such as increasing daily roundtrips to San Jose. The plan should also discuss the strategic separation of passenger rail and freight rail where appropriate and feasible.</p> <p>The ITSP should recognize local goods movement planning efforts currently under way in the region and around the State. For instance, MTC and their partners Alameda County and D4 is preparing a regional goods movement plan that will coordinate planning among the Bay Area and surrounding regions (Sac and San Joaquin). Highlight local and regional planning efforts and coordinate the outcomes with the ITSP.</p> | <p>Potential Capitol Corridor increased service was identified in the San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area-Sacramento-Northern Nevada Corridor, but specific improvements will be addressed in the California State Rail Plan and Capitol Corridor Intercity Passenger Rail Service Business Plan.</p> <p>Local goods movement planning efforts will be incorporated into the California Freight Mobility Plan, which will inform future ITSPs.</p>   |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization              | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments   | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| 35        | Heminger, Steve   | MTC                       | MPO                    | Chapter 4 |         | <p>ITSP should highlight the substantial investments on I-80 from regional bridge toll revenues which includes the Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation project and the I-80/I-680/SR-12 interchange. Bridge tolls have also been invested in the Capitol Corridor within the Bay Area.</p> <p>The ITSP should also recognize the I-880 and I-238 corridors as important interregional routes alongside I-580.</p> <p>Suggests that ITIP funds could be considered for future phases of the SMART passenger rail and pathway project.</p> <p>Add language to acknowledge that the Central Coast and San Joaquin Valley East-West corridor also serves interregional traffic originating and terminating in the San Jose/SF Bay Area. The high volume per lane of traffic on SR 152 between Gilroy and SR 156 illustrates the need to upgrade this highway facility section from a rural two-lane facility to better serve increasing traffic on this major east-west interregional corridor.</p>   | <p>The ITSP did not specifically identify regional bridge toll revenues, but will be considered in future analysis of the related Strategic Interregional Corridors.</p> <p>I-880 and SR 238 were included in the corridor summary for the San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area-Central Valley-Los Angeles Corridor.</p> <p>The SMART project was identified in the summary of the San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area-North Coast Strategic Interregional Corridor. It can be considered for ITIP funding and would be assessed through the project evaluation criteria for potential interregional value.</p> <p>The link to San Jose and San Francisco in the Central Coast and San Joaquin Valley East-West Connections Corridor was identified in the freight and highway sections of the corridor summary.</p>  |
| 36        | Various           | CalWalks and Partner Orgs | Non-profit/advocacy    |           |         | <p>Disappointed that the ITSP did not fully incorporate all the modified suggestions to the vision and objectives of the plan, nor the additional objectives suggested in the 2014 comment letter.</p> <p>Fully integrate active Transportation, Multimodality, Sustainability, and Equity into the ITSP Vision and Objectives; prioritize investments in interregional rail; advance multimodal and livable Corridors to mitigate barriers and impacts to health, active transportation, and conservation; commit to transparency in the ITIP review process.</p> <p>Integrate GHG emission reductions, public health, and equity into project evaluation criteria. Interregional projects should also be evaluated using public health and social equity metrics.</p> <p>Highway capacity expansion priorities are at odds with State climate goals. Capacity expansions of the interregional system for freight purposes must take into account how the interregional system is also used for local/regional trips. Evaluate the potential of induced demand of local/regional trips on the interregional system since many of the trips generated on the system are local/regional.</p> <p>Capacity expansion should not be the default strategy for addressing freight capacity issues.</p> | <p>The 2015 ITSP vision and objectives and the project evaluation evaluation criteria incorporated many concepts not included in previous versions of the plan including sustainability, mode shift, active transportation, design resiliency, energy conservation, environmental sustainability principles, and the integration of all modes.</p> <p>Recommendations from the CTC included in the August CTC Meeting requested GHG reduction be a greater element of the project evaluation criteria and will be added if required for approval by the CTC. The evaluation for using public health and social equity metrics in project evaluation was not included, but will be considered for future addition to the project evaluation criteria which will be used during the development of the ITIP.</p> <p>The California Freight Mobility Plan identifies the freight movement strategies for California, which are incorporated in the ITSP. Improvements to intercity passenger rail services can have positive impacts on freight movement.</p> <p>The California Freight Mobility Plan will consider all potential project types for addressing freight capacity issues.</p> |

# Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization   | Public, District, MPO?    | Chapter   | Section | Comments  | Addressed   |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---|---|
| 37        | Carpenter, Matt   | SACOG  | MPO                       | N/A       | N/A     | SACOG is concerned that SR 20, SR 49, SR 99 (SR/99-SR70 split an Butte County) and US 50 have not been included in the ITSP. Add them as Strategic Interregional Corridors.   | These routes have been included in Strategic Interregional Corridors, but have not been identified as Priority Interregional Facilities. Other routes were designated as the priority interregional facilities for the respective corridors.  |
| 38        | Schultz, Kim      | Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission | Transportation Commission | Chapter 4 |         | <p><b>Central Coast - San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area Corridor Analysis</b></p> <p>Include Santa Cruz county in the list of counties contributing to the region's population base and projected growth. Requests that SR 1, 17, and 129 be included and are deemed to be critical connections as origins/destinations of activity centers that impact US 101.</p> <p>Promote the Complete Streets to realize sustainable goals of the ITSP to provide safe mobility and accessibility for all users of highways that also serve as Main Streets, these include: SR 1/Mission Street within the City of Santa Cruz, SRs 129 and 152 through the City of Watsonville, and SR 9 through the San Lorenzo Valley.</p> <p>Freight rail service should be emphasized as a method of reducing truck traffic on US 101 and realizing concomitant reductions in congestion and emissions. Cites US 101 Central Coast California Freight Plan and other programs that are effective corridor management strategies.</p> <p>Sustainability measures and actions should include programs for all segments of the population and modal options, such as: Intercounty paratransit service; Carpool and Vanpool programs serving interregional travel demand; and Intercity passenger rail and feeder and express bus service: (such as the Highway 17 Express Service provided by Santa Cruz Metro, VTA, AMTRAK/Capitol Corridor, and Caltrans)</p> <p>ITIP Funds should be focused on projects that cannot be funded through SHOPP.</p> | <p>Did not include Santa Cruz and SR 1, 17, and 129.</p> <p>The Complete Streets policy was identified in the plan and the project evaluation criteria captures elements of Complete Streets.</p> <p>The use of Freight Rail is identified in the California Freight Mobility Plan. Freight rail is an important element in the interregional system, but ITIP funds for rail can only be used for passenger service. Of course, improvements in passenger service can lead to benefits to freight movement.</p> <p>The identified sustainability measures and actions should be considered for all improvement projects and services.</p> <p>Generally ITIP funds are used for projects that cannot be funded through the SHOPP.</p> |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter   | Organization                      | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter   | Section | Comments   | Addressed   |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|--|---|
| 39        | Hale, Debra         | TAMC                              | RTPA                   | N/A       | N/A     | <p>ITSP should acknowledge that adequate funding resources are needed to implement both the regional and interregional transportation plans. ITSP and ITIP should recognize the need to adopt strategies that provide new funding resources to complete priority transportation projects.</p> <p>Recommends that geographic equity be taken into consideration as an additional performance metric. Suggests to use the phrase, "strategically fund projects that add road capacity" in order to give flexibility to the regions and local needs.</p> <p>Requests that SR 156 projects be listed as top regional priority in the ITSP. Capitol Corridor Extension and Monterey-Salinas Transit intercity bus lines should be listed as ITIP priorities.</p> <p>Clarify between Capitol Corridor Extension and Coast Daylight, amend Figure 8 to include Capital Corridor Extension. ITSP should identify priority interregional bicycle routes for funding; Caltrans should make a priority of investing in active transportation modes with funds such as Cap and Trade and ATP.</p>                      | <p>Strategic capacity increases of the highway system was included in the ITSP as a strategy in Chapter 5.</p> <p>The Monterey-Salinas Transit District was identified in the Central Coast-San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area Corridor summary as providing local, regional, and intercounty service, but was not included as an ITIP priority. Improvements to highways can support the intercity bus service, but elements such as buses are not fundable through the ITIP.</p> <p>SR 156 was listed as a high priority for ITIP funds in the Central Coast and San Joaquin Valley East-West Connections Corridor. The Capitol Corridor Extension was listed as a long-term priority to be funded through ITIP, RTIP, Local, Cap and Trade, and FRA funds.</p> <p>Active transportation modes can be funded through the ATP, but some projects that support active transportation such as expanding the highway shoulders while making mainline improvements will be funded through the ITIP.</p> |
| 40        | Steinhauser, Dianne | Transportation Authority of Marin |                        | Chapter 4 | N/A     | <p><b>San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area - North Coast Corridor</b></p> <p>Recommends that the completion of Marin-Sonoma Narrows US 101 Phase 2 project be listed as a priority.</p> <p>Revision to paragraph: "The corridor provides vital connections to support the area's recreational tourism and interregional economic and serves urban/suburban areas such as Santa Rosa, San Rafael, and numerous smaller communities."</p> <p>Requests that SR 37 be adds as an important east-west highway facility in the "Highway" subsection.</p> <p>Recreational traffic may not be interregional along parts of the corridor, however, it will likely increase as Marin County oftentimes serves as the Bay Area's backyard and is the gateway to Sonoma and Napa Valley wine country and economies.</p> <p>Revise paragraph: "When investments on US 101 are to be considered, the analysis shows the greatest benefits will be to closing many existing two lane conventional highway section gaps for greater safety and travel reliability and completion of HOV lanes in Marin and Sonoma counties.</p> | <p>The paragraph was revised as requested.</p> <p>SR 37 was included in the highway section of the San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area-North Coast Corridor.</p> <p>Recreational traffic comment noted.</p> <p>Most facilities have both a regional and interregional component. The future analysis of the Strategic Interregional Corridors and the System Planning documents produced by Caltrans districts (such as the Transportation Concept Reports) will consider the impacts of different types of travel to identify future system needs.</p>   |
| 41        | Condon, Dale        | Condon Construction Services      | Public                 | N/A       | N/A     | <p>Happy to not see US 199 in the ITSP. I once road a bicycle from Gasquet to Crescent City. It was so scary with so little room that until wider bike lanes are added, there should be warning signs. Going from Gasquet to Obrien Oregon should be out of the question for cyclists</p>  | <p>Comment noted.</p>   |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter   | Organization                                   | Public, District, MPO?    | Chapter | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|---------|---------|---|--|
| 42        | Stevens, Linda      |  | Public                    | N/A     | N/A     | Reconsider the removal of SR 49 and SR 20 and designate the routes as a priority in the 2015 ITSP.  | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |
| 43        | Scherzinger, Sharon | EDCTC  | Transportation Commission |         |         | <p>ITSP is too focused on the goods movement economy - tourism is ranked number behind micro-electronic sales and ahead of ag and food products.</p> <p>Add US 50 and reconsider the removal of SR 49. Recommends the ITSP include recommendations of the Bay to Tahoe Basin Recreation and Tourism Travel Impact Study. Recreational travelers use I-80 and US 50 equally to get to Tahoe from the Bay Area; Sac metro users rely on US 50.</p>  | <p>Goods movement and recreational tourism were considered in the development of the ITSP. In the San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area-Sacramento-Northern Nevada Corridor I-80 and US 50 serve recreational travel at a high level, but I-80 has considerably more freight movement. The combination of freight movement and recreational tourism combined were the reasons I-80 was identified as the Priority Interregional Facility in the corridor.</p> <p>SR 49 was included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as a Priority Interregional Facility. This is an important routes to the local region and the State, but I-80 facilitates considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.</p> |
| 44        | Scofield, Ed        | Nevada County Board of Supervisors             | Public                    | N/A     | N/A     | <p>Include SR 20 and SR 49, which act as a lifeline route to several communities in Nevada, Placer, and Sierra counties. These two facilities are critical to Nevada county's farm-to-market economic distribution, with a crop production of \$23 million.</p> <p>SR 49 is an important multimodal corridor and acts as an interregional public transit corridor providing connections to Placer County Transit and Amtrak Capitol Corridor Intercity Passenger Rail at the Auburn Conheim multimodal station. Cites SR 49 as a Safety Corridor as well.</p> | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |
| 46        | Andersen, Terri     | City of Nevada City                            | City Council              | N/A     | N/A     | Reconsider the removal of SR 20 and SR 49.  | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |
| 47        | Hasan Ikhata        | Southern California Association of Governments | MPO                       | Various | Various | Multiple comments in a six page letter  | Incorporated many of the comments into the plan.   |

**Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter                          | Organization                   | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter | Section | Comments  | Addressed  |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------|---------|---|--|
| 48        | Ahron Hakimi                               | Kern Council of Governments    | MPO                    | N/A     | N/A     | <p>The ITSP is a paradigm switch from highway safety to mass transportation.</p> <p>Kern, Inyo, and Mono Counties entered into a programming partnership to deliver several widening projects along these highways. In our case Caltrans contributes 40% share of ITIP funding.</p> <p>Will this MOU continue to be honored or will the priority for this corridor be supplanted by new priorities for mass transportation? Please explain how the MOU and Caltrans' 40% partnership will be preserved.</p> | <p>One goal of the ITSP is to consider the value of investing in all modes that serve interregional travel. To develop an entire interregional system we need to integrate the modes. Caltrans has and always will develop projects to improve the safety of all travelers.</p> <p>Caltrans is committed to working with local partners on improvements to the State highways system and honoring the commitments in the MOU. Programming decisions will be made during the development of the ITIP and will be analyzed based on the project selection criteria in the 2015 ITSP.</p>   |
| 49        | Joseph Ontinveros                          | Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians | Tribe                  | N/A     | N/A     | Request for Consultation  | Consultation provided.   |
| 50        | Jerry Barton                               | Rural Counties Task Force      | Advocacy Group         |         |         | Focus on tourism, recreational travel, and farm to market; do not consider funding restrictions - identify all funding needs  | <p>Tourism and recreational travel were considered in the analysis of Strategic Interregional Corridors, but future analysis will expand these elements as data and modeling improve the ability to assess the interregional impacts of these travel purposes.</p> <p>The Strategic Interregional Corridors provided an overview of the entire corridor, which will be expanded as we further analyze these corridors. The priorities identified in each corridor is for the next 20 plus year to match the timeframe of the plan. This can be revisited every five years as the ITSP is updated.</p> <p>The specific improvements will be developed through district Transportation Concept Reports and Corridor System Management Plans.</p> |
| 51        | Bruce Jones, Deborah Jones, and Chet Krage | Citizens for Highway Safety    | Advocacy Group         |         |         | Keep SR 49 as a Focus Route   | <p>Focus Routes were not included in the 2015 ITSP. Priority Interregional Facilities were developed which were based on different objectives than the 1998 ITSP.</p> <p>SR 49 was included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as a Priority Interregional Facility. This is an important routes to the local region and the State, but I-80 facilitates considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.</p>   |
| 52        | Stephanie Ortiz                            | Sierra College                 |                        |         |         | Add SR 49 and SR 20 to list of priority facilities  | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |

# **Draft 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan - Public Comment Caltrans Responses**

| Comment # | Name of Commenter | Organization                                 | Public, District, MPO? | Chapter | Section | Comments   | Addressed  |
|-----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| 53        | Multiple Signers  | Central Coast Coalition                      |                        |         |         | US 101 capacity improvements should be a priority; SR 46 and SR 156 should be priority connectors; support Capitol Corridor extension and Santa Barbara intercity rail | US 101, SR 46, and SR 156 are included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities. The Capitol Corridor extension is included in the list of priorities in the Central Coast-San Jose/San Francisco Bay Area Corridor.   |
| 54        | Anne Mayer        | Riverside County Transportation Commission   | RTPA                   |         |         | Extend the western terminus of the I-10 Corridor to the Riverside/San Bernardino County Line   | I-10 has been extended west of the Riverside/San Bernardino County Line.   |
| 55        | Anne Mayer        | Riverside County Transportation Commission   | RTPA                   |         |         | Include SR 60 from I-10 to the eastern limit of Moreno Valley  | SR 60 has been included in the summary for the Southern California - Southern Nevada/Arizona Strategic Interregional Corridor. It was not considered for inclusion in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities because it is not identified as an Interregional Road System under California Streets and Highways Code.                                       |
| 56        | Anne Mayer        | Riverside County Transportation Commission   | RTPA                   |         |         | Add SR 74 as a high priority corridor  | SR 74 was not included in the list of Priority Interregional Facilities because it does not meet the objectives of the 2015 ITSP - it does not connect regions and it is not a significant freight movements facility. Also, since it goes through a State park, it is unlikely it can be expanded sufficiently to become a significant freight movement facility. |
| 57        | Celia McAdam      | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | RTPA                   |         |         | Add SR 20 and SR 49  | SR 49 and SR 20 were included in the Strategic Interregional Corridors, but not added as Priority Interregional Facilities. These are important routes to the local regions and the State, but other routes (I-5 and I-80 specifically) facilitate considerably higher levels of interregional people and freight movement.  |